UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,112	01/24/2001	Jean-Michel Moutin	859063.490	5354

500 7590 10/05/2007

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVE
SUITE 5400
SEATTLE, WA 98104

EXAMINER	
WONG, ALLEN C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2621	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/770,112	MOUTIN, JEAN-MICHEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Allen Wong	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 July 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5,8-14,16-24 and 27-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5,8,9 and 29* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *10-14,16-21,23,24,27 and 28* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *22,30 and 31* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/25/07 have been fully read and considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding lines 15-17 on page 9 and lines 14-17 on page 10 of applicant's remarks, applicant asserts that Sun does not disclose prioritizing the received coded images. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In figure 8, Sun discloses the elements 60, 61 and 65 that receive the prioritized data of the coded image data. Thus, Sun discloses prioritizing the received coded images.

Regarding line 20-21 on page 9 of applicant's remarks, applicant asserts that Sun is not an appropriate primary reference. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In figure 8, Sun discloses the variable length decoder 64 that decodes the image data sequences. Thus, Sun discloses the decoding the coded images using the single MPEG decoder, thereby decoded images of first and second images sequences. Thus, Sun is an appropriate primary reference.

Regarding lines 21-23 on page 9 of applicant's remarks, applicant asserts that the teachings are not combinable. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Fukushima teaches the decoding images from more than one MPEG stream, as noted in Fukushima's figure 4, where elements 115-118 are MPEG decoders that can decode images from more than one MPEG stream. Also Fukushima discloses elements 12 and 22 of figs.7, 12, 13, and 15, as well as figure 10, elements 231 and 232. So Fukushima was applied to meet the deficiencies of Sun.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sun and Fukushima, as a whole, for efficiently decoding high quality images, saving financial costs by robustly reducing hardware requirements, as disclosed in Fukushima's column 3, lines 58-64.

The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Thus, the combination of Sun and Fukushima is appropriate and reasonably combinable because both Sun and Fukushima pertain to the same, analogous MPEG encoding/decoding environment.

Regarding lines 3-13 on page 10 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that the examiner did not address the argument that "receiving a first sequence of frame-interlaced coded images and a second sequence of non-frame-interlaced coded images. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In figure 8, Sun discloses image sequence data is received at element 65, where fields (non-frame) are received as well as interlaced frames. The use of interlaced frames formed from interlaced fields (non-frame) data is well known to one of ordinary skill in the MPEG encoding standard.

Regarding lines 18-25 on page 10 of applicant's remarks, applicant asserts that Sun does not disclose decoding the coded images using the single MPEG decoder. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In figure 8, Sun discloses the variable length decoder 64 that decodes the image data sequences. Thus, Sun discloses the decoding the coded images using the single MPEG decoder, thereby decoded images of first and second images sequences. Thus, Sun is an appropriate primary reference.

Regarding line 26 on page 10 to line 2 on page 11 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Fukushima teaches away from the present invention, and that the combination of Sun and Fukushima would not yield the present invention. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Fukushima teaches the decoding images from more than one MPEG stream, as noted in Fukushima's figure 4, where elements 115-118 are MPEG decoders that can decode images from more than one MPEG stream. Also

Fukushima discloses elements 12 and 22 of figs.7, 12, 13, and 15, as well as figure 10, elements 231 and 232. So Fukushima was applied to meet the deficiencies of Sun.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sun and Fukushima, as a whole, for efficiently decoding high quality images, saving financial costs by robustly reducing hardware requirements, as disclosed in Fukushima's column 3, lines 58-64.

The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413,

208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Thus, the combination of Sun and Fukushima is appropriate and reasonably combinable because both Sun and Fukushima pertain to the same, analogous MPEG encoding/decoding environment.

Claims 17 and 27 are rejected for similar reasons as claim 10 by dependency.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9 and 29 are patentable. Dependent claims 22, 30 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding the last paragraph on page 13 to line 3 on page 14 of applicant's remarks about claim 18, applicant states that claim 18 is not disclosed in the prior art. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Sun discloses an MPEG decoder configured to decode a plurality of MPEG image sequences from one MPEG stream, as taught in figure 8 in that the MPEG decoder used to decode plural images from a GOP or a group of frames. In figure 8, Sun discloses the image sequence data is received at element 65, and as disclosed in column 1, lines 26-28, Sun discloses I, P and B images are plural image types of MPEG. Thus, Sun discloses a controller coupled to the MPEG decoder and configured to control the MPEG decoder.

In column 8, lines 19-26, Sun discloses decoding commands are inputted from 370 are then relayed to the decompress controller 360 and then to element 64, where decoder state sequence or image type, such as interlace images as it is obtained in

MPEG coding standard, is sequenced or prioritized during decoding, and that in fig.8, element 64 is the variable length decoder that decodes the image data sequences. Thus, Sun discloses a received frame-interlaced image sequence is decodable following an associated decoding order.

In column 8, lines 19-26, Sun discloses decoding commands are inputted from 370 are then relayed to the decompress controller 360 and then to element 64, where decoder state sequence or image type, such as non-interlace or progressive images as it is obtained in MPEG coding standard, is sequenced or prioritized during decoding, and that in figure 8, element 64 is the variable length decoder that decodes the image data sequences. Thus, Sun discloses a received non-frame-interlaced image sequence is decodable following an associated decoding order.

Sun does not specifically disclose the series of synchronizing periods, however, Oku teaches the use of synchronization periods, as disclosed in figure 11, where the use of horizontal and vertical synchronization signals with the display period. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sun and Oku, as a whole, for efficiently and precisely decoding image data by minimized circuitry, memory and hardware requirements, as disclosed in Oku column 3, lines 25-48.

Sun and Oku do not specifically disclose decoding images from more than one MPEG stream in parallel. However, Fukushima's figure 4 teaches there are decoders 115-116, 117 and 118 used to decode MPEG images, and that elements 115-118 are in parallel of one another. Thus, when using Fukushima in combination with Sun and

Oku as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sun, Oku and Fukushima, as a whole, for efficiently decoding high quality images, saving financial costs by robustly reducing hardware requirements, as disclosed in Fukushima's column 3, lines 58-64.

Dependent claims 11-14, 16, 19-21, 23, 24 and 28 are rejected for similar reasons.

Thus, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10, 17 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun (5,455,629) in view of Fukushima (6,477,204).

Regarding claim 10, Sun discloses a method for decoding a plurality of MPEG sequences simultaneously using a single MPEG decoder, comprising:

receiving a first sequence of frame-interlaced coded images and a second sequence of non-frame interlaced coded images (fig.8, note image sequence data is received at element 65, where fields (non-frame) are received as well as interlaced frames);

receiving a stream of decoding commands, each decoding command corresponding to a respective one of the coded images (col.12, ln.33-52 and fig.8,

element 360 receives decoding commands and element 370 functions together with 360 for processing decoding commands of the image data);

prioritizing the received coded images based on whether the coded image is a frame-interlaced coded image and on when the corresponding decoding command was received (fig.8, note elements 60, 61 and 65 receive the priority data of the coded image data);

decoding the coded images using the single MPEG decoder based on the prioritizing, thereby producing decoded images of first and second images sequences (fig.8, element 64 is the variable length decoder that decodes the image data sequences);

saving the decoded images (fig.8, element 66, 314 and 316 store decoded image data).

Sun does not specifically disclose decoding images from more than one MPEG stream. However, Fukushima teaches the decoding images from more than one MPEG stream (fig.4, note elements 115-118 are MPEG decoders that can decode images from more than one MPEG stream; also see elements 12 and 22 of figs.7, 12, 13, and 15; see fig 10, elements 231 and 232). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sun and Fukushima, as a whole, for efficiently decoding high quality images, saving financial costs by robustly reducing hardware requirements (Fukushima's col.3, ln.58-64).

Regarding claim 17, Sun discloses the images are read from a memory device and the decoded images are saved to the memory device (fig.8, element 66, 314 and 316 images are read from memory and stored decoded image data).

Regarding claim 27, Sun discloses wherein the first decoded image sequence is a decoded image sequence from a first MPEG stream (fig.8, note image sequence data is received at element 65, where fields (non-frame) are received as well as interlaced frames). Sun does not specifically disclose decoding images from more than one MPEG stream. However, Fukushima teaches the decoding images from more than one MPEG stream (fig.4, note elements 115-118 are MPEG decoders that can decode images from more than one MPEG stream; also see elements 12 and 22 of figs.7, 12, 13, and 15; see fig 10, elements 231 and 232). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sun and Fukushima, as a whole, for efficiently decoding high quality images, saving financial costs by robustly reducing hardware requirements (Fukushima's col.3, ln.58-64).

Claims 11-14, 16, 18-21, 23, 24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun (5,455,629) and Oku (5,880,786) in view of Fukushima (6,477,204).

Regarding claim 18, Sun discloses a device, comprising:

an MPEG decoder configured to decode a plurality of MPEG image sequences from one MPEG stream (fig.8 is an MPEG decoder used to decode plural images from a GOP or a group of frames); and

a controller coupled to the MPEG decoder and configured to control the MPEG decoder (fig.8, note image sequence data is received at element 65, and col.1, ln.26-28 disclose I, P and B images are plural image types of MPEG) such that:

a received frame-interlaced image sequence is decodable following an associated decoding order (col.8, ln.19-26, note decoding commands inputted from 370 are then relayed to the decompress controller 360 and then to element 64, where decoder state sequence or image type, such as interlace images as it is obtained in MPEG coding standard, is sequenced or prioritized during decoding, and that fig.8, element 64 is the variable length decoder that decodes the image data sequences); and

a received non-frame-interlaced image sequence is decodable following an associated decoding order (col.8, ln.19-26, note decoding commands inputted from 370 are then relayed to the decompress controller 360 and then to element 64, where decoder state sequence or image type, such as non-interlace or progressive images as it is obtained in MPEG coding standard, is sequenced or prioritized during decoding, and that fig.8, element 64 is the variable length decoder that decodes the image data sequences).

Although Sun does not specifically disclose the series of synchronizing periods (ie. "first period", "second periods", etc.), however, Oku teaches the use of synchronization periods (fig.11; note the use of horizontal and vertical synchronization signals with the display period in that images can be decoded according to the periods ascertained from synchronized data). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sun and Oku, as a whole, for

efficiently and precisely decoding image data by minimized circuitry, memory and hardware requirements (Oku col.3, ln.25-48).

Sun and Oku do not specifically disclose decoding images from more than one MPEG stream in parallel. However, Fukushima teaches the decoding images from more than one MPEG stream in parallel (fig.4, note elements 115-118 are MPEG decoders that can decode images from more than one MPEG stream in parallel; also see elements 12 and 22 of figs.7, 12, 13, and 15; see fig 10, elements 231 and 232). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sun, Oku and Fukushima, as a whole, for efficiently decoding high quality images, saving financial costs by robustly reducing hardware requirements (Fukushima's col.3, ln.58-64).

Regarding claim 19, Sun discloses wherein the controller comprises a prioritizing module configured to assign a decoding priority to received frame- interlaced image sequences that are not decoded in a first period following their associated decoding order (col.8, ln.19-26, note decoding commands inputted from 370 are then relayed to the decompress controller 360 and then to element 64, where decoder state sequence or image type, such as non-interlace or progressive images as it is obtained in MPEG coding standard, is sequenced or prioritized during decoding).

Regarding claim 20, Sun discloses the use of a pointer memory for storing the beginning addresses of each of the images to be displayed (fig.8, element 370 and 360 are used to aid the storage of images to be displayed).

Regarding claim 23, Sun discloses assigning a decoding priority to received image sequences (fig.8, note elements 60, 61 and 65 receive the priority data of the coded image data, and that col.8, ln.19-26, note decoding commands inputted from 370 are then relayed to the decompress controller 360 and then to element 64, where decoder state sequence or image type is sequenced or prioritized during decoding, thus assigning priority to a sequence of images).

Regarding claim 24, Sun discloses the controller is configured to control the MPEG decoder (fig.8, note image sequence data is received at element 65, and col.1, ln.26-28 disclose I, P and B images are plural image types of MPEG). Sun and Oku do not specifically disclose decoding images from more than one MPEG stream in parallel. However, Fukushima teaches the decoding images from more than one MPEG stream in parallel (fig.4, note elements 115-118 are MPEG decoders that can decode images from more than one MPEG stream in parallel; also see elements 12 and 22 of figs.7, 12, 13, and 15; see fig 10, elements 231 and 232). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sun, Oku and Fukushima, as a whole, for efficiently decoding high quality images, saving financial costs by robustly reducing hardware requirements (Fukushima's col.3, ln.58-64).

Regarding claims 16 and 21, the examiner takes Official Notice because interlace and non-interlace or progressive images are typically used and well known in MPEG.

Regarding claims 14 and 28, Sun discloses prioritizing the decoding commands by assigning to each decoding command a priority level based on the image type of the

coded image corresponding to the decoding command (col.8, ln.19-26, note decoding commands inputted from 370 are then relayed to the decompress controller 360 and then to element 64, where decoder state sequence or image type is sequenced or prioritized during decoding) and assigning a higher priority to the first image (fig.8, note HP is the higher priority and LP is the lower priority).

Sun does not specifically disclose the use of synchronizing periods, however, Oku teaches the use of synchronization periods (fig.11; note the use of horizontal and vertical synchronization signals with the display period). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sun and Oku, as a whole, for efficiently and precisely decoding image data by minimized circuitry, memory and hardware requirements (Oku col.3, ln.25-48).

Regarding claims 11-13, Sun discloses prioritizing the decoding commands by assigning to each decoding command a priority level based on the image type of the coded image corresponding to the decoding command (col.8, ln.19-26, note decoding commands inputted from 370 are then relayed to the decompress controller 360 and then to element 64, where decoder state sequence or image type is sequenced or prioritized during decoding).

Sun does not specifically disclose the series of synchronizing periods, however, Oku teaches the use of synchronization periods (fig.11; note the use of horizontal and vertical synchronization signals with the display period). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sun and Oku, as a

whole, for efficiently and precisely decoding image data by minimized circuitry, memory and hardware requirements (Oku col.3, ln.25-48).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9 and 29 are allowed.

4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art does not specifically disclose the specific combination of limitations as disclosed in claim 1: a device comprising: an MPEG decoder structured to decode several coded images from at least a first and a second MPEG stream for displaying simultaneously one image of the first MPEG stream and one image of the second MPEG stream, the coded images belonging to a first type or to a second type, the images of the first type being frame interlaced images comprising two fields, the decoding of which is completed in two periods, one of the periods being equal to the time duration of one field display, and the images of the second type being interlaced half-images or progressive images, the decoding of which is completed in one of the periods; and a decoder control circuit for controlling the MPEG decoder, the decoder control circuit being configured to receive an order to decode a plurality of images at each of the periods and including a priority assignment circuit structured to, at each period, grant among the images to be decoded a decoding priority such that the highest decoding priority is granted to images of the first type that have received their decoding order for more than one of the periods, a lower decoding priority is granted to images of the second type, and the lowest decoding priority is granted to images of the first type

that have received their decoding order for less than one of the periods. Similarly, the prior art does not specifically disclose the combination of limitations of claim 8.

5. Claims 22, 30 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art does not specifically disclose wherein prioritizing the coded images includes: assigning a first priority level to a first decoding command received during a preceding synchronization period and corresponding to the first sequence of frame-interlaced coded images; assigning a second priority level, lower than the first priority level, to a second decoding command corresponding to the second sequence of non-frame-interlaced coded images; and assigning a third priority level, lower than the second priority level, to a third decoding command received during a current synchronization period and corresponding to the first sequence of frame,interlaced coded images, as disclosed in claim 30. Claim 22 is patentable for similar reasons.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-7341. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Thursdays from 8am-6pm Flextime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Allen Wong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2621

AW
10/1/07